

shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by Law make or alter such Regulations, except as to the Places of choosing Senators.

Article II, section 1, clause 4 reads:

The Congress may determine the Time of choosing the Electors, and the Day on which they shall give their Votes; which Day shall be the same throughout the United States.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Congress chose to exercise its power in regard to presidential elections as early as 1792. Language similar to the current regulations was first adopted some 50 years later in 1845. The Act now in effect, that of June 25, 1948, provides that the electors of President and Vice President shall be appointed, in each State, on the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November, in every fourth year succeeding every election of a President and Vice President.

Election day for Members of the House of Representatives was first established by Congress in the act of February 2, 1872. The regulations now in force fix the day for the election of Representatives as the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November, in every even-numbered year. Congress has also provided that the time for the election of Senators shall be the same day upon which the States elect their Representatives.

From the dates of the first statutes cited above, it is evident that Congress for many years permitted the States great latitude in determining the days of election. A wide variety of practices arose.

At first, the problem involved only the election of Representatives. Presidential electors were originally chosen by the State legislatures and the exact date on which they were appointed was not important.

After the election of 1824, however, nearly all the States that had not already done so began to choose their electors by popular vote, thus raising the problem of the day or days upon which the election was held.

Practice among the States in these early years diverged in two respects: the actual dates, and the number of days. While all the States chose their electors in November, New York held her election on the first Tuesday after the first Monday, whereas New Jersey held hers on the first Tuesday and the day following. In 2 States the second Monday was election day; in 14, the first Monday; in 2, the second Tuesday, and in 2 the Friday nearest the first of November.

There was an even wider discrepancy among the dates set for the election of Representatives, and many States during this same period specified an election period of more than 1 day. For example, Mississippi, when it entered the Union, designated the first Monday and the day following in September. Other States using more than 1 day included: Illinois, the third Thursday and the 2 succeeding days in September; Alabama, the third Monday and the suc-

ceeding day in September; and Michigan, the first Monday and the succeeding day in October.

The reason for stopping this practice was that too often roving bands of voters marched across State lines in order to vote for a second or third time in another State. With modern clerical procedures and mass communication, this could be prevented today.

At the present time, there certainly are abuses in the registration and casting of votes. Vigilance at the polls and stronger State control is necessary to avoid fraud and misrepresentation, one of the most vicious enemies of a free society. Nevertheless, voting on 2 days would not, I believe, make an appreciable difference in the opportunities for and incidence of fraud. In fact, by avoiding crowded polling places and hectic voting deadlines, we might even cut down on opportunities for vote frauds and corrupt election practices.

To conclude, with the total percentage of Americans who now vote hovering around 60-70 percent, I think there is much merit in going back to the earlier practices of many States of holding elections on 2 days. At least, such a proposal is deserving of congressional hearings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1749) to prescribe the time for elections of Senators and Representatives in Congress and for choosing the electors of President and Vice President, introduced by Mr. KEATING, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 25 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (2 U.S.C. 7), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 25. The day for the election in each of the several States of Representatives in Congress shall be the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November in every even numbered year, except that in years in which electors for President and Vice President are appointed the Wednesday next after such Tuesday shall be an additional day for such election in each such State."

(b) Section 6 of the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, eighteen hundred and seventy-six, and for other purposes", approved March 3, 1875 (18 Stat. 400), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 2. The first section of title 3 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 1 The electors of President and Vice President shall be appointed in each State on the Tuesday and Wednesday next after the first Monday in November in every fourth year succeeding every election of a President and Vice President."

SEC. 3. This Act shall be effective beginning with the elections and appointment of electors which, but for the enactment of this Act, would have occurred on November 3, 1964.

STRENGTHENING OF FEDERAL FIREARMS ACT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request of the Attorney General, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to strengthen the Federal Firearms Act. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Attorney General requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1750) to strengthen the Federal Firearms Act, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., April 6, 1961.

THE VICE PRESIDENT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: The Department of Justice recommends the enactment of legislation "to strengthen the Federal Firearms Act."

The Federal Firearms Act (52 Stat. 1250; 15 U.S.C. 901, et seq.) prohibits the shipment of any firearms in interstate or foreign commerce, to or by a person who is under indictment or has been convicted of certain specified crimes of violence such as murder, kidnapping, robbery, rape, mayhem, etc. It further prohibits a person who has been convicted of such a crime or is a fugitive from justice, from receiving such firearms. The proposed legislation would amend these provisions to bring within their scope any person who has been convicted of a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding 1 year.

It is the view of the Department that this legislation would aid Federal law enforcement officers in their assault on organized crime. The Department of Justice, therefore, urges its early introduction and enactment.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this recommendation.

Sincerely,

Attorney General.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE AND INFORMATION

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I introduce a joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee of the House and Senate on Foreign Intelligence and Information, and ask that it be appropriately referred.

I introduce the joint resolution in my own name and in the name of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]; the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]; the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]; the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF]; the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK]; the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT]; and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA].

I ask that it be printed and lie on the desk for 1 week, in the event additional Senators wish to cosponsor the measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will lie on the desk as requested by the Senator from Minnesota.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 77) to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence, introduced by Mr. McCARTHY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. McCARTHY. The joint resolution is similar to one which was considered quite thoroughly by the Senate in the year 1956. It has been introduced by a number of Members of the House of Representatives in times past. The purpose is to establish a joint committee to establish some kind of continuing supervision over foreign policy activities and foreign intelligence and information programs by the U.S. Government.

The recent controversy over the question of responsibility for the unfortunate events with reference to the invasion of Cuba, and the discussions as to who was responsible, as to whether the Government was misinformed or not, simply emphasize the need which has been demonstrated in the past with reference to the Suez crisis, the U-2 incident, and a number of less significant and somewhat minor events.

The joint resolution is not, directly or indirectly, meant to express any criticism of this administration or of any past administration, but, basically, to reflect what I consider to be a proper responsibility on the part of the Members of the U.S. Congress to accept responsibility in this field, to be informed, and to be involved when major policy decisions are called for.

Under the Constitution, Congress is called upon to participate in a declaration of war. In modern times, war is not declared. Congress, therefore, has a continuing and a very substantial responsibility for policy decisions with regard to the cold war or conducting foreign policy by any other means.

It is my hope the joint resolution will be considered and, in some form, adopted, so that the machinery and procedures which are the constitutional responsibility of Congress may be exercised.

INTERNATIONAL FOOD AND RAW MATERIALS RESERVE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have submitted today a resolution aimed at creation of an international food and raw materials reserve. This resolution authorizes and requests the President and our national representatives to negotiate a plan with other free nations of the world for using our food abundance to be submitted to this body for final approval.

In his statement on agricultural policy for the New Frontier, President Kennedy stated the need for a second International Conference on Food and Agriculture similar to the one held at Hot Springs, Va., in 1942 under the leadership of President Roosevelt, to deal on a

constructive multilateral basis with the food needs of the world.

President Kennedy said further that this conference should have as its specific goal the organization of an agency to undertake the transfer of surplus food and fiber stock from those nations with surpluses to those nations in desperate need of food and fiber supplies to combat hunger and to promote economic development.

It is well to note that the past administration favored a multilateral approach to the distribution of surplus food and fiber stock. President Eisenhower, in his address before the United Nations on September 22, 1960, stated:

The United States is already carrying out substantial programs to make its surpluses available to countries of greatest need. My country is also ready to join with other members of the United Nations in devising a workable scheme to provide food to member states through the United Nations system, relying on the advice and assistance of the Food and Agriculture Organization.

I hope this Assembly will seriously consider a specific program for carrying forward the promising food for peace program.

Farmers of the free world through their international organization, the International Federation of Agricultural Producers, have repeatedly expressed support for such a program to make sure that farmers receive a fair price for their food and fiber production, and those people in need of food or fiber will have a chance to get it.

This resolution is of interest to farmers of the United States because it will permit agricultural production, while at the same time provide with other like-minded nations a constructive approach to making abundance available to the tens of millions of people overseas who are in dire need of food and clothing. The interest of farmers in other nations is basically the same as that of our own producers. Farmers everywhere need assurance of uses for their production at a price which reflects parity or equality with other sectors of their economic systems that contribute similar investment and labor.

I have believed for a long number of years that our Government should give additional status and attention to making use of the machinery which exists under the Food and Agriculture Organization. Instead of firmly supporting a multilateral approach to utilizing the farmers' production of the world, we continue to rely in the main on what is essentially a reaction to crisis in the administration of programs designed to increase the use of food and fiber. An international food and raw materials reserve will contribute to economic stability. It can be a powerful instrument on the war against want in the developing nations where the frontiers of freedom are under threat; it can provide an export market for our stockpile of food; it can free farmers of the adverse effects of excess stocks; and it can demonstrate the ability of the free world nations to work together for the lives of all.

Lord John Boyd-Orr, first Director General of FAO, had this to say about

the international food and raw materials reserve:

This is neither a revolutionary, nor a new idea. The proposal merely synthesizes many national and international measures and brings them together in one organization. . . . We are living in a world which is being driven so fast by the advance of science that bold measures are required if we are to resolve the tremendous social and economic problems that face all countries. . . . There are only two alternatives for nations today. Either cooperation for mutual benefit in a world policy, or a drift back to nationalistic policies leading to economic conflict which may well be the prelude to a third world war that will end our civilization. . . . If the nations cannot agree on a good program affecting the welfare of the people everywhere there is little hope of their reaching an agreement on anything else.

As a student of biology, a farmer, and a doctor of medicine, Lord John Boyd-Orr considered food as something much more than a mere commodity alone. As a farmer, however, and like all farmers he appreciated trade aspects shrewdly enough. But over and above this, he saw food, as all farmers do, as the primary necessity of life itself. Being a medical man seems to have something to do with his thinking that civilization has a profound moral obligation to provide food for those hungry and in need, just as it has a duty to provide medical care for those who are sick and in need.

Mr. President, I think Boyd-Orr's statement that I have just quoted epitomizes the thinking of farm families in the United States.

If the United States should assume the lead as a result of favorable Senate action on this resolution, I am firmly convinced that support would develop among the free and democratic nations and who could benefit greatly in increased living standards, and economic development generally.

There are still many nations where primary producers who make up a greater percent of the population are subject to wild fluctuations of markets and monetary exchanges.

The shrinking of the world through improvements in communication and transportation makes imperative the elimination of such wild ups and downs in prices to primary producers. Greater stability of prices and incomes in the lesser developed areas will be of benefit both to U.S. citizens and to the citizens of the other free and democratic "have" nations.

More effective means of distributing our abundant food and that of other nations through an international reserve would greatly strengthen the U.S. position among peoples in Asia, the Middle East, Africa and even Latin America. These people are trying to climb out of hopeless poverty and dependence to the kind of security and freedom we enjoy under our Constitution and Bill of Rights.

The kind of commonsense foreign policy which would result in the United States taking the lead in the negotiation of a plan or agreement for a world food reserve is the only policy that is consistent